



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DEUTSCHE GRAMMATIK. Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neu-hochdeutsch von W. Wilmanns, O. Professor der deutschen Sprache und Literatur an der Universität Bonn. Dritte Abteilung: Flexion—2. Hälfte. Strassburg. Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1909. Pp. 317-772.

The first half of this volume was reviewed in the *Journal*, Vol. VI, pp. 492-507. The second half treats of the inflection of nouns and adjectives, the uses of the cases, gender, and number.

The historical method is pursued throughout. The development is traced from the oldest records down to the language of our own time. The reviewer had occasion to complain somewhat of the treatment of the present period in the first half of the volume. Professor Wilmanns evidently is more interested in the older stages of the language. In the second half of this volume he seems to the reviewer to have gone too far in his neglect of current speech. His conclusions at this point are sometimes quite doubtful, sometimes erroneous. This clear-headed scholar who has so often led us safely through the intricacies of historical development does not here always convince us. Nowhere does he here seem to have extensive materials of his own, but appears to be guided by his own speech-feeling, or by some grammatical treatise on the subject in question. This is to be much regretted, for the declension of nouns is the most difficult part of German grammar. Not only foreigners need light here, but Germans also are not infrequently in need of information here, as shown by the fluctuations in present usage. In his study of modern grammatical literature on this subject Professor Wilmanns has entirely overlooked a number of good German grammars written by Danes, Hollanders, Englishmen, and Americans. This subject of nouns has greatly worried foreigners, and some of them in their study of this part of German grammar have made some fine observations. In the following pages the writer desires to call attention to a number of deficiencies in Professor Wilmanns's work, in the hope that the corrections may be helpful to those interested in German grammar, and also that they may lead to a more careful revision on the part of the author.

In the treatment of the inflection of nouns Professor Wilmanns takes up masculines and neuters separately. This method is helpful for the older periods, but is misleading for the present state of the language. One of the characteristic features of modern German grammar is the grouping of masculines and neuters *together*. In the living language the neuter noun has

no distinctive declension of its own, but follows the model of the masculines. Survivals of older usage, such as a neuter plural in *-er*, are still to be found, but no new neuter noun will ever again enter the language with a plural in *-er*. All new neuters will follow masculine models.

In his treatment of the strong noun Professor Wilmanns states (p. 384) that the group of monosyllabics with a mutated plural in *-e*, is larger than the non-mutating group. This seems to the writer to be the greatest and most serious error in the whole book. It indicates that Professor Wilmanns does not understand the principal development in the modern declension of nouns. The writer gives in his "Grammar of the German Language," pp. 75-77, the list of the monosyllabic masculines with a plural in *-e* without mutation, and pp. 81-83, the mutating group. The mutating group is complete, but the non-mutating group can easily be increased by adding many technical words. It is a simple fact that the non-mutating group is larger. This is clearly shown by the fact that this type is felt as the great model toward which old German nouns are now moving, as *Schlote* rather than *Schlöte*, and to which all new masculines and neuters, whether of one syllable or more, conform where no difficulties of form or meaning stand in the way, as *Putsch*, pl. *Putsche*; *Aeroplan*, pl. *Aeroplane*. There was a time when the mutating group was felt as a living model. As a result of this older condition of things we have a number of foreign nouns that mutate in the plural, as *Pläne*, *Altäre*, *Bischöfe*, *Kanäle*, etc. Today words in this group are moving toward the non-mutating group, such as *Generale* rather than *Generäle*, etc. A number of them have abandoned the group entirely, as *Bibliothekare*, *Journale*, etc. The mutating group is no longer a living force in the language. It will probably never again attract a new word to itself. It is quite evident that the non-mutating group is felt as the most appropriate model for new words. It is by far the most productive group, and if certain formal principles were not in the way, it might still attract a large number of nouns. Masculines and neuters in *-el*, *-en*, *-chen*, *-er* are prevented from following it as an *-e* can nowhere in nouns follow *-el*, *-en*, *-er*. Diminutives in *-lein* follow those in *-chen* as they are so closely related to them in meaning and use. It might even be practical for teachers of German to regard nouns in *-el*, *-en*, *-chen*, *-er*, *-lein* as belonging to the plural class in *-e*; i. e., they belong here but elide the *-e*. Although most foreign nouns glided easily into this *e*-plural group, nouns with foreign case endings as *-um*, *-us*, etc., could not easily fit themselves into this group. It is interesting, however, to note how many of them are in spite of these difficulties modifying their

form so that they can assume the *-e* in the plural, as *Partizipium*, pl. *Partizipien*, or *Partizip*, pl. *Partizipe*. Some even append the plural *e* to the foreign endings, as *Globus*, pl. *Globen* or *Globusse*. Notice that in these cases as in a very large number of other words the weak declension is employed when the strong plural *-e* cannot be used on account of the presence of the foreign case ending. These foreign case endings are usually unaccented. This peculiarity of accent here has become intimately associated with the inflection so that the language of the present period seems to be developing in accordance with the following rule: Foreign words accented on the last syllable add *-e* in the plural, while those unaccented on the final syllable add *-en* in the plural: *der Majór*, pl. *die Majóre*, but *der Professór*, pl. *die Professóren*; *der Kantón*, pl. *die Kantóne*, but *der Dämón*, pl. *die Dämónen*. Many former exceptions are now falling into line with the rule. Thus the plurals *Reptílien*, *Minerálien*, etc., are now often replaced by *Reptíle*, *Minerále*, etc.

It should be noticed that the use of the weak plural in the foregoing cases results from certain difficulties of *form*. The weak inflection here has no particular meaning as distinguished from the strong declension. Where, however, the weak inflection is employed in both singular and plural, it has quite uniformly a distinctive meaning. It indicates a living being in contradistinction to a lifeless object. In the present period this inflection has developed this meaning so clearly that it now is distinctly felt. The list of words so inflected is very large indeed: *Philolog*, *Student*, *Diplomat*, *Gymnasiast*, etc. We read with astonishment in Professor Wilmanns' book (p. 379) that the weak declension in the present period has become very much reduced. In fact the weak declension has been working constructively, and has developed a clear meaning and two characteristic forms. The weak form either ends in *-e* or an accented syllable: *Knábe* and *Astronóm*. The meaning decides the question of inflection: *Katalog* strong, but *Geolog* weak. The weak inflection adapts itself easily to either one of its two forms, but the final decisive factor is the meaning. The list of weak foreign nouns accented upon the last syllable representing living beings is so large that it is evidently a living productive type. Strange to say, however, foreign words accented upon the last syllable representing living beings are strong if they end in *-al*, *-an*, *-än*, *-ar*, *-är*, *-eur*, *-ier*, *-ön*, *-ör*: *Admirál*, *Kapitán*, *Missionar*, *Offizier*, etc. There are some exceptions, but the rule is an excellent one. In looking over the long list of nouns with these endings it is difficult to find an adequate explanation for the strong inflection here. The only plausible

explanation that the writer can suggest is that many of these words formerly formed their plural by adding *-s*; later they followed the large group of foreign words which *dropped -s* and added *-e* in the plural as an indication that they had become naturalized. A number of these words formerly added *-en* instead of *-e* in the plural, and some of them do still as *Husaren*, *Hospodaren* or *Hospodare*, etc. It seems that present usage after a long struggle has recognized the list of strong endings as given above. Aside from these strong endings nouns accented upon the final syllable representing living beings are weak.

On p. 450 Professor Wilmanns remarks that the genitive of names of persons and other names, and also of foreign words earlier in the period, often dropped the genitive ending *-s* when a modifying word preceded, and that this careless usage has in recent times greatly increased. It seems imperative to the writer to separate these three categories, for usage in each differs. The dropping of the *-s* here is the rule in names of persons when the genitive follows, and not infrequent when the genitive precedes: *der Hut des kleinen Wilhelm*, *des kleinen Wilhelms* (or *Wilhelm*) *Hut*. In case of names of cities, countries, and continents, the older genitive with the ending *-s* is still quite common in every style of literature. It is not archaic at all, but common even in the daily newspapers: *den Eindruck des vielhunderttürmigen Moskaus zu schildern* ("Hamburger Nachrichten," April 2, 1905). The writer has a large collection of such examples. The genitive *-s* is now much more commonly used than dropped in case of foreign nouns not names. The examples given by Professor Wilmanns, *die Handlung des Drama*, *der Mangel alles Interesse*, would be avoided today by choice writers. The writer has also a large collection of examples at this point covering the period of the last fifty years. His materials clearly show that the tendency is to employ here the *-s*. It seems that the dropping of genitive *-s* will prevail in case of names of persons. It may possibly prevail in case of other names, but the genitive *-s* will surely become ultimately fixed in all foreign nouns not names, unless perhaps in certain words ending in a sibilant, as *des Naturalismus*, etc. The steady increase in the use of genitive *-s* in foreign words illustrates clearly the increasing carefulness of modern writers. It has become a habit upon the part of German linguists to censure current speech. It has never occurred to any one that it might be in order to prove his statements and to compare the language of the present with the speech of the great classical writers.

On p. 448 Professor Wilmanns formulates the rule that when an article-less title precedes a name only the name is inflected:

in den Predigten Pastor Hermanns. He adds that only the title *Herr* forms an exception to this rule. The writer read this rule with astonishment. Fluctuation existed here in the M.H.G. period, and still exists. Title and name may form a compound noun, and then the genitive -s is added to the second component element; i. e., the name as in the example cited by Professor Wilmanns. On the other hand, each word may be considered as independent and each receive inflection: *die Tochter des alten, als halb toll bekannten Herrn von Sparr, des Jägermeisters weiland Kurfürsten Joachims* (Wildenbruch); *auf eine Einladung Kaisers Wilhelms* (Hamburger Nachrichten, Oct. 5, 1909). Double inflection here was quite common in M.H.G., and is still sometimes found even in the daily newspapers, but it is much more common to suppress the inflection in the name as the preceding genitive clearly marks the case: *Neben der Grabstätte der Gattin Herzogs Konrad des Roten* (Steinhausen's "Geschichte der deutschen Kultur," p. 111); *ein Brief Königs Ludwig* (Kölnische Zeitung). The writer has a large collection of such examples. This same doubleness of conception is found where title and name follow as appositives a noun in the genitive preceded by an article or other modifying word: *in der Zeit des Reichskanzlers Grafen Caprivi* (Otto Hötsch in "Deutsche Monatsschrift," Feb., 1907, p. 601); *die Feier des ersten Geburtstages unseres jüngsten Hohenzollern, Prinz Wilhelms* ("Daheim," 1907, No. 41). As the governing genitive is preceded by an article or other modifying word the appositives *may* be uninflected: *die Reden unseres Reichskanzlers Fürst Bismarck*. This last form is the one given by Professor Wilmanns on p. 449. He gives, however, only *one* form, while usage recognizes *three* forms. In the writer's large collection of examples, it seems clear that present usage is inclining more and more to mark apposition by some clear formal sign rather than to leave the reader to gather the relation from the connection.

On p. 452 Professor Wilmanns says of the inflection of words not really substantives but sometimes used as such, such as *mein Gegenüber*, *das Auf und Ab*, *die Wens und Abers*, etc., that they either remain uninflected or at most only take -s in the genitive singular and throughout the plural. In a grammar of this size it should surely be stated that some of these substantives are inclining towards the regular strong inflection with e-plural: *Kehrausse* (Vult spielte noch 5 oder 6 Kehrausse—J. Paul), *Saufausse* (frequently in colloquial speech), *ihre Stelldicheine* (J. Paul), *Taugenichtse* (common), *Tunichtgute* (Fontane's Pog. VIII), *über uns deutsche Gernegrosse* (Wil-

helm Anz in "Zeitschrift des Allgemeinen Sprachvereins," 1906, Nr. 9, p. 268), *diese Nimmersatte* (common), etc.

On p. 453 Professor Wilmanns states that unmodified nouns connected by *und* lose all inflection: *mit Herz und Hand*, etc. He has, however, overlooked the fact that plural nouns must here be inflected: *zwischen Herr und Gemeinde*, *zwischen Hausvater und Familienmitgliedern* (Lamprecht's "Deutsche Geschichte," zweiter Ergänzungsband, p. 360.)

On p. 446 Professor Wilmanns says of the inflection of numerals: "Ein jüngerer Versuch, pronominale Genitive auf *-er* zu bilden (mhd. vierer, fünfer), dringt nicht durch." The term "pronominal genitive" is evidently incorrect, for this is adjective inflection, as both the strong ending *-er* and the weak *-en* are used according as the numeral is not preceded by an article or the article precedes it. Other grammarians, on the other hand, even recommend adjective inflection here: *Zehn Schüler haben gearbeitet; dieses sind die Arbeiten vierer, achter—ebenso hunderter, tausender* (Wetzels "Die deutsche Sprache," p. 199, 12th ed.). *Das Schicksal aller vieren* (Blatz's "Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik," p. 390). This inflection seems to the writer fairly well established in case of *hundert* and *tausend*. He has a large collection of examples: *das Leben tausender* (Grillparzer's "König Ottokar," 4), *vor den Augen hunderttausender von Lesern* (Jensen's "Heimkunft," VII), *die Augen tausender* (Heer's "Der König der Bernina," chap. XV), *die Unkosten der Ansiedelung vieler tausenden* (v. Zepelin in "Deutsche Monatschrift," April, 1904, p. 68), *das Endresultat aller der tausenden von Beobachtungen* (Professor Wiechert in "Deutsche Rundschau," Sept., 1907, p. 380), etc.

On p. 467 Professor Wilmanns discusses the question of using or dropping the impersonal subject *es* in connection with the well-known group of verbs expressing a state of the mind or body, such as *hungert, durstet, friert, schwitzt, bangt, graut, graust, dünkt, schwindelt*, etc. He remarks concerning these verbs: "Neben all diesen Verben wird im Mhd. *ëz* nicht gebraucht und auch im Nhd. ist es nur bei wenigen üblich geworden, besonders neben präpositionalen Verbindungen." It is unfortunate here that the discussion is marred by such an inaccurate statement. It is a simple fact that *es* is required with every one of these verbs when the *es* introduces a principal proposition: *Es friert mich*. The *es* may, on the other hand, be dropped in the subordinate clause and where it does not introduce a principal proposition: *wenn mich friert, da fror mich, friert dich?*, etc., but we may also say: *da fror es mich*, etc. Usage differs here very much with different verbs and with different authors, but it is quite clear that impersonal *es* is not

used as much with this group of words as with other impersonal verbs. Professor Wilmanns offers the following explanation for this fact: "Je enger das Abhängigkeitsverhältniss ist, um so mehr wird der abhängige Kasus als das eigentliche Subjekt (logisches Subjekt) der Aussage empfunden und um so schwerer dringt das Scheinsubjekt ein." This explanation does not seem to the writer to be in accord with the plain facts of the language. If the person is felt as subject, it becomes at once nominative: *ich friere*. There are here two constructions with a difference of meaning. The accusative represents the person as affected or impressed, the nominative represents him as acting or suffering: *mich friert*, *mich dünkt*, representing the person as affected or impressed; *ich friere*, representing the person as suffering. The force of the accusative which is still very common here must still be distinctly felt. Modern feeling here recognizing a verb and an object is trying to conform such utterances to the common type, and is attempting to introduce here a subject. As no definite subject can be found it employs the indefinite *es*. Older usage was content with simply indicating that a person was affected. The question still remains: Why is this particular group of words more conservative than other verbs in thus retaining the older form of expression? Other verbs cannot now drop the *es*. It seems to the writer that *mich hungert*, *mich friert*, *mir graut*, etc., are old and very common set expressions still largely employed under the stress of lively feeling and hence not so liable to be conformed to the conventional type. The forms *es hungert mich*, *es friert mich*, are evidently modern literary expressions.

On p. 469 Professor Wilmanns discusses the modern form of subjectless propositions containing a partitive genitive, such as *Ē im der Hülfe kaeme, den sic doch Sifrit gewan*: Before any help could come to him Siegfried had won the victory. Professor Wilmanns believes that the genitive here was felt as the logical subject of the proposition, and hence the formal subject *es* did not later work its way into this construction. This is the same argument he applies to the accusative construction discussed in the preceding paragraph. Also here his explanation is not supported by the facts. The old accusative construction still exists, but the genitive construction has passed entirely away. The old genitive is today construed as the real grammatical subject and the verb agrees with it in number: "Unweit wird die heilige Wiese sich befunden haben, wie *deren* in diesem Kulte oft vorkommen" (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's "Griechische Tragödien," II, p. 105). How could *es* become the subject of a verb in the plural? In the older periods the verb here was always in the singular. Later this construction

was replaced by the present one, where the genitive, here *deren*, has become not the logical subject but the real grammatical subject and thus determines the number of the verb. Professor Wilmanns states that this genitive construction is now rare, but the writer has a collection of examples large enough to please an experienced curiosity-hunter. It is quite true, however, that the nominative is now more common here than the genitive, so that the sentence of Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorff might now more commonly run: "Unweit wird die heilige Wiese sich befunden haben, wie *sie* in diesem Kulte oft vorkommen."

On p. 467 occurs the statement in *Anm.* 2. that the subject of such an impersonal verb as *regnet*, etc., can now never be omitted. The writer believes that it is possible that the old subjectless form of statement may still occur after clauses introduced by *wie* and *als*: *Ich hörte nie ein so heftiges Donnern, als da oben donnerte; ich hörte nie fürchterlicher donnern, als da oben donnerte.* The writer is a foreigner, and has of course no right to speak here as he has not been able to find any examples in the literature of the present period, but he presents these curiosities to German readers as his German colleague Professor Eduard pronounces them good German as far as his speech-feeling goes. The writer would be glad to hear the opinion of other Germans.

On p. 470 Professor Wilmanns makes the statement that the subject *es* cannot be used in the impersonal passive construction if in the active form of statement there is no direct object. This is evidently a slip of the pen. The subject *es* can always be used here if it introduces the proposition: *Es wird hier nicht gelärmt.* If, however, it does not introduce the principal proposition, *es* must drop out. Why? As far as the author knows, this point has not been explained. Perhaps originally the participle was subject here, as in "Schlecht geritten (participial subject) ist besser als gut gegangen:" *Hier wird schlecht geritten* (subject), literally *Bad riding is going on here.* The use of the subject *es*, as in *Es wird hier schlecht geritten*, seems to point to this origin. The *es* is in fact not an impersonal subject, but a provisional subject, as in *Es war einmal ein König.* The *es* in the so-called passive construction must just as provisional *es* drop out when it does not introduce the principal proposition. Like provisional *es* it also cannot stand in a subordinate clause.

On pp. 470-2 Professor Wilmanns treats the important subject of the history and use of the logical or provisional subject *es*, as in *Es war einmal ein König.* The writer is disappointed that the discussion is not fuller. He had been looking forward to the appearance of the volume in which this subject would be treated. This *es* is the most wonderful word in German syn-

tax. It marks the boundary line of two ages, Old High German and Middle High German. In the one age it is unknown, in the other it is absolutely indispensable. Though a light slender word, without accent or meaning, it has been the means of preserving to us some of the most marked peculiarities of older German syntax. It is worthy of better treatment than it has received at the hands of grammarians. Even its origin is not yet clear to us. Grimm regarded it as a nominative. Erdmann thinks it is an adverbial accusative. Wilmanns remarks: "Mir scheint, dass man es weder als Nominativ noch als Akkusativ ansprechen darf, denn sein Gebrauch erwächst aus Konstruktionen, in denen beide Kasus vorkamen." The writer does not feel that Professor Wilmanns has thrown any light on this difficult question. Grimm's theory seems to the writer the only one that is in any measure satisfactory. In the last years the writer has returned to this question repeatedly, and is still working away at it. It seems to him that the origin of the construction might have been in such a sentence as Otfrid's (I, 17, 54): *ȝrscein in sar tho ferro ther seltsano sterro*. At the beginning of the sentence we learn that something appeared, and we do not learn what it was until we reach the last word. It does not at the beginning actually say that *something* appeared. Only the word *appeared* is actually used, but the word *something* naturally suggests itself. This word in German is the indefinite *es*. The writer has collected a large list of such examples. There is in every one of them the evident desire to arouse our curiosity, to hold us in suspense. This object could be still better attained by introducing the sentence with the indefinite *es*. There was in Old High German no apparent need of this word *es*, as it never occurs. In the beginning of the Middle High German period there arose a feeling that a verb ought not to introduce a declarative sentence, as this word-order was more suitable for a question. Perhaps at this point the use of *es* began. It thus fulfilled the double purpose of distinguishing a declarative sentence from a question, and at the same time preserving the favorite old word order of introducing the proposition with a verb and placing the subject at the other end for emphasis. The *es* probably from the very beginning was weakly accented and little felt, for in the preceding period there was no tendency to use it at all. It must, however, have had some appreciable force, for it cannot even today be dropped, while in the two categories mentioned below that developed out of it the *es* is not infrequently omitted in lively language. This provisional subject *es* pointing forward to a definite subject that is to be mentioned later is quite freely used today except in case of the pronominal subjects *er*, *sie*, *es*. Professor Wilmanns says that *es* is not em-

ployed at all in case of these pronominal subjects, but in fact this usage is occasionally found: *Es irrt auch er* (Goethe). Sanders gives a few more examples in his "Hauptschwierigkeiten," p. 270. The personal pronouns are usually light unaccented words, and hence they seem out of place in the important position at or near the end of the proposition. Other heavier pronouns are freely used here: *Es können sich nur wenige regieren* (Schiller). *Es weiss ja niemand, wann er zuletzt zur Beichte gegangen ist.*

The use of *es* here gave rise to its use in two other categories which are, however, far less common. In Old High German the verb was placed at the head of the sentence to emphasize it or to render the idea of activity prominent: "Iugun sie giuuisso" (Otfrid, IV, 19, 33); "*They surely lied.*" The use of *es* as a provisional subject in the common construction just discussed suggested its use elsewhere to place the verb in the important place at the beginning of the sentence and to mention the subject later. Thus the use of *es* has preserved to us the older usage of emphasizing the verb by bringing it forward. This usually occurs in two distinct categories. In the first one the verb is brought forward to emphasize the meaning of the verb: "*Es irrt der Mensch, so lang er strebt.*" The *es* is not used here in case of the provisional subjects *er*, *sie*, *es*, as they themselves can introduce the sentence as well as provisional *es*: "*Er will nicht, aber er muss kommen.*" As all these pronouns are light unaccented proclitics, and are not felt as an independent element, the verb is felt as occupying the first place. The older usage of placing the verb at the beginning of the sentence without the introduction of *es* is, however, not entirely forgotten. In lively language it often occurs in colloquial language and abounds in the realistic literature of our own time: Trude: "*Und du—zeigst sie jetzt an?*" Förster: "*Muss ich*" (M. Dreyer's Winterschlaf, I).

The other category where *es* is employed is in narrative style. In the beginning of stories, ballads, etc., the past tense of a verb is often brought forward to introduce a narrative of past events with a scene of lively activity or by the choice of a verb of rest or state to call attention to a picture of things long since passed away: *Es zogen drei Bursche wohl über den Rhein. Es stand in alten Zeiten ein Schloss, so hoch und hehr.* In lively language older usage without *es* still asserts itself here: *War einst ein Glockengiesser zu Breslau in der Stadt* (Wilhelm Müller's "Der Glockengiesser zu Breslau").

The writer knows of no other categories where provisional *es* is employed. In all of these it is in the nominative relation. Professor Wilmanns remarks on p. 472: "Wir empfinden as

weder als Subjekt noch als Objekt, höchstens als eine blasse adverbiale Bestimmung. Mit Recht vergleichen Grimm und Erdmann es mit dem Adverbium *da*, das im Deutschen und in andern germanischen Sprachen ähnlich gebraucht wird, aber mit stärker gefühlter demonstrativer Kraft." The English *there* corresponds here closely to German *es* in meaning and force. The writer does not feel that it has in the least degree stronger demonstrative force than *es*. With regard to meaning and force, *there* and *es* are completely identical, but they are of different origin and this difference of origin prescribes to each word different grammatical boundaries. English *there* is an adverb, and hence can stand after the verb: *Was there ever a braver man? Once upon a time there lived a good king.* As the German *es* is not an adverb, but a mere provisional subject used for the specific purpose of distinguishing a declarative sentence from a question, it cannot be used at all in a question and becomes superfluous where some other word introduces the sentence. If some other word begins the sentence, the real subject can without the aid of *es* be removed to the end of the sentence for emphasis. The English *there* has always been an integral part of the sentence, and is grammatically so still. It has lost only in force. It has been weakened and degraded to a mere formal introduction to the sentence, but it is still in grammatical rank an adverb and does not lose its place in the sentence if some other word precedes. German *es* did not exist in previous periods. It never had any grammatical standing at all, and drops out immediately when some other word precedes. It owes its existence to a mere formal peculiarity in modern German word-order that does not allow a declarative sentence to begin with a verb. In the development of the modern sentence it often seemed desirable to retain the verb in the first place. This was done in substance by placing before the verb a light unaccented provisional subject in the form of indefinite *es*.

One of the most marked differences between English *there* and German *es* is that the latter cannot be employed in the subordinate clause. This lets in a flood of light upon the nature of the German subordinate word-order. It can be seen from the above treatment that the use of *es* is connected with emphasis and fine shades of thought and feeling. Thus where *es* is found there is a flow of thought and feeling. The subordinate clause is in German presented more dispassionately as a *compact unit*. Hence, *es* cannot be employed here, for it would cause a disturbance in the set word-order of the subordinate clause. In English, however, we are here perfectly free: "He told us the beautiful story, that there once had lived in this old house a man who had deeply influenced the lives of our parents." This

sprightly narrative form is in German entirely lost in the rigidity of the subordinate clause. When the heart of the German warms up, he casts off the fetters of hypotaxis and employs parataxis here and can then relate as warmly as in English "Er erzählte uns: Es wohnte," etc.

Similar to the provisional subject *es* is the anticipative subject *es* which points forward to a following infinitive or subordinate clause that explains more fully the indefinite *es*: "Es ist eine der hauptsächlichsten Eigentümlichkeiten, die ihn (i. e. Caesar) von Alexander, Hannibal und Napoleon unterscheidet, dass in ihm nicht der Offizier, sondern der Demagog der Ausgangspunkt der politischen Tätigkeit war" (Mommsen). Here *es* also serves as a mere provisional subject, while the real subject is for the sake of emphasis reserved for the important position at the end of the sentence. There is, however, one remarkable difference between provisional *es* and anticipative *es*. The latter is often retained when some other word introduces the sentence: "Heute macht *es* mir grosses Vergnügen, Sie hier zu sehen." In accordance with older word order, however, the *es* can often drop out. The writer does not know that any law has been discovered in these omissions. It seems to him, however, from a large number of examples in his collection that there is a tendency to retain it, if it is desired to emphasize the predicate, while it drops out if the subject is to be emphasized: "*Richtig ist es*, dass er morgen kommt," with the stress upon *richtig* and falling inflection after *es*, but with the omission of *es* and rising inflection after *ist* to call attention to the subject: "*Richtig ist*, dass er morgen kommt."

On p. 574 Professor Wilmanns interprets *tiefen* in *voller tiefen Sorgen*, as a dative after *voller*. It is in fact a weak genitive. This becomes perfectly clear in other examples: "Die Ode ist voller musikalischen Gemälde" (Lessing); *Voller schönen Abdrücke* (Goethe); *voller peinlichen Erwartung* (Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, Jahrg. 1901, Nov. 9, p. 5.). The strong form of the adjective is more common here: "die Zukunft *voller dunkler* Wolken" (Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, April 29, 1905).

On p. 675 Professor Wilmanns, commenting upon older usage in such sentences as *den man dā hiez dēr ritter rot* (Parzival 206, 16) remarks: "Jetzt brauchen wir regelmässig den Akkusativ; den Nominativ nur, wenn das Substantiv unbekleidet steht." Such sentence as "Und ich sage euch, dass ich kein Bedenken trüge, ihn *heiliger Ruffinus* zu nennen" (Ertl's "Die Stadt der Heiligen"), are common in all parts of Germany in all styles of literature. It is a natural impulse to preserve the exact form of direct address.

On pp. 486 and 672 Professor Wilmanns sees a nominative in such constructions as *Wache stehen*, *Bote gehen*, etc. He later adds that perhaps there is here no distinct feeling of a definite case, that perhaps the original construction in a number of instances was in connection with a preposition: *ich sihe dēn videlaere an dēr schiltwache stān*. Whatever may be the origin of many of these constructions, there is a distinct feeling today that the complement of the verb should be in the accusative: "Ich soll nun für drei Batzen *Boten* gehen" (Hauptmann's "Der arme Heinrich," 3). "Sie waren verreist." "Ja, bei einer Nichte in Oberschlesien *Paten* gestanden" (Paul Keller's "Waldwinter," IX).

On p. 589 Professor Wilmanns treats of the Middle High German constructions *ieman vremder* (gen. pl.) and *ieman anders* (gen. sing.). He says of the former construction that it has been abandoned, but that the latter has become general. It seems strange that such a statement could appear in a learned work. It seems all the more strange because he refers to Blatz II, p. 380, A. 54, where the constructions are properly treated. Of course, in the accurate sense both constructions have disappeared. The forms *jemand Fremder* and *jemand Fremdes* are in fact exactly the same as in Middle High German, but *Fremder* is no longer felt as genitive plural but as masculine nominative singular in apposition with *jemand*. *Fremdes* is now felt as neuter nominative singular in apposition with *jemand*. It seems strange to the writer that many grammarians do not seem to know the construction *jemand Fremder*. The writer has found an apparent case of this construction in "Nibelungenlied:—" "darumbe ich *niemen vremden* füere in dize lant (Zarncke's ed., p. 238).

On p. 676 Professor Wilmanns says of the construction "Lassen Sie den Grafen *diesen Gesandten* or *dieser Gesandte* sein: "Im allgemeinen gilt der Akkusativ." The writer regards this as a hasty judgment. It seems to him from the basis of a large collection of examples that the nominative is also very common here and constantly gaining upon the accusative.

On p. 704 the writer read with astonishment that the preposition *entlang* is rarely used. It is much used in the position after the noun, most commonly requiring in this case the accusative, but the dative is also quite common. If the dative is used, it may precede or follow the noun. From the collection in the possession of the writer it seems that the dative is gaining upon the accusative here. The dative is here so common that it does not seem necessary to give examples.

On p. 758 Professor Wilmanns remarks that *all* is always inflected strong. The expression *des allen*, *dem allen* are so common in good writers that they deserve at least mention.

On p. 656 Professor Wilmanns states that *mich dünkt* is more correct than *mir dünkt*. It is scarcely worth while to give examples here of *dünken* with the dative. It is freely used by the best authors of our time. It often seems more natural to use the dative as it emphasizes the personal element: "Die Stimme dünkte ihm lieblich" (P. Heyse's "Marienkind," p. 91); "Keiner hatte ihr bisher gut genug gedünkt" (C. Viebig's "Die Wacht am Rhein," p. 8).

On p. 494 Professor Wilmanns joins the throng of grammarians who reluctantly acknowledge the existence of the use of the dative with *lehren*. It seems, however, to be common in every style of literature: "Hat doch Lothar Bucher in seinem Engländerhass behauptet, die Briten hätten erst von den Indiern in ihren Kolonien die Sorgfalt des Badens und Waschens gelernt, die sie dann ihrerseits dem Kontinent lehrten" (R.M. Meyer in "Archiv für Kulturgeschichte," 1905, Band III, p. 8). "Er erbot sich, * * * ihm die Chirurgie zu lehren" (Kühnemann's "Herders Leben," p. 17). "Wie die blonde Lotsentochter ihm, dem steifen Nordschleswiger das Englisch und das Küssen lehrte" (Frenssen's "Hilligenlei," X). "Denn wenn auch Herr Reimers durchaus nicht zu den strengen Vätern gehörte, so lehrte dem jungen Dinge doch eine frühreife Wahrnehmung, dass usw." (Wilhelm v. Polenz's "Liebe ist ewig," p. 7). In the passive the dative is the more common construction: "Mir ist das nicht gelehrt worden." In the passive Professor Wilmanns thinks it is better to avoid both construction and choose some other word: "Ich wurde im Griechischen unterrichtet oder unterwiesen." Professor Wilmanns would scarcely insert some other word for *gelehrt* in the following sentence: "Bist du nicht gelehrt worden, Gott zu fürchten?" (Wildenbruch's "Kind Heinrich," 7). Professor Wilmann's advice to avoid *lehren* is hardly to be taken seriously. The plain fact is that there is considerable fluctuation in good usage with regard to the cases to be employed with *lehren*. Many writers have evidently forgotten or are not heeding the oft repeated warnings of their school-teachers, and are following the natural impulse to conform to the common type of a dative and an accusative rather than the unfamiliar one of a double accusative. The history of German syntax is the history of changing types, and usage with *lehren* indicates clearly that this process is still going on. Just as historians often enter sympathetically into the history of peoples that have long since passed off the scene of action, grammarians likewise defend sympathetically decaying constructions. The life of the past is nearer to them than the throbbing present.

GEORGE O. CURME.

Northwestern University.